



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE PAULINE MANUSCRIPTS F AND G. A TEXT-CRITICAL STUDY.

By WILLIAM BENJAMIN SMITH,
Tulane University.

II.¹

WE might proceed indefinitely with this comparison ; such a work would easily swell into a volume. But we must not pass over the false division in 5 : 6, where G has $\epsilon\iota\sigma\ \tau\iota$ ^{*ut quid*}, but F $\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\iota$. . . *ut quid*.

In vs. 9 we read

<i>multo</i>	<i>magis</i>	<i>justificati</i>	<i>nunc in</i>	<i>sanguine</i>
Πολλω	μαλλον	δικαιωθεντες	νυν εν τω	αιματι
θανεν. Πολλω μαλλον δι		<i>us est. Multo magis justi</i>		
καιωθεντες νυν εν τωαιμα		<i>ficati nunc insan</i>		

Is it not plain that F is following a model that is not G? Else why was *θανεν* carried forward to the beginning of a new line? Still more, why was *τι* likewise torn off and carried forward, the second line being closed with *αιμα*? There is ample room in both cases for the detached syllables to close the lines naturally and in harmony with G.

At this point we may remark that this phenomenon of letters detached at the end or beginning of a line, where there is no apparent reason for detachment, and where *but for this detachment* the lines in F would match the lines in G precisely, beginning and ending alike — this phenomenon is conspicuous and constantly recurring, and of itself is decisive against the derivation theory of Hort and Zimmer. For we hold it to be psychologically impossible for F to have copied G into lines of slightly varying length, or number of letters, and yet to have been absolutely uninfluenced, in ending his lines, by the endings in G. When it was indifferent whether one or two letters more or less be placed in a line, the fact that the G-line lay there before him ending with a certain letter (or word) would infallibly have determined the copyist to end his line according to the pattern set before him. Now we have examined and noted all these endings, and we affirm there is no trace whatever in F of any adaptation of endings to the endings in G. Agreements do frequently occur, but no more

¹ See this JOURNAL, Vol. VII, pp. 452–85, July, 1903.

frequently than from the law of probability we should naturally expect. On the other hand, disagreements by excess or defect of two or three letters, or even of a single letter, present themselves abundantly, and often so perversely as to be entirely unaccountable on the hypothesis that F is transcribing G. There is no way to see the full force of this argument except by direct vision of the two codices.

Resuming we find in vs. 10 in G ^{per mortem} δια του θανατου, but F omits του. In vs. 12 we find the inverse of the phenomenon in vs. 9: the line in G ends with αυου; but in F it is lengthened beyond the average by adding δι torn away from διηλθεν, which is at the beginning of the next line in G.

In vs. 15 G has ^{si enim} Ει γαρ, but F has
i enim unius de ι γαρ τω του ενοσ παραπτωμα

Similarly in vs. 20, both N (from νομος) and L (from lex) have been omitted. Space has been left for N, in fact four spaces, which shows the absence of a capital, but none for L, whence it would appear that, in the original (F'), L had been written in the margin. So in vs. 18 both A (from αρα) and I (from igitur) have been omitted, and spaces are left. None of these omissions are suggested by anything in G. It seems impossible to resist the conviction that F is here copying a model in which these divisions have already been made, from which the capitals have already been lost as already explained, and that he is copying with slavish fidelity, letter by letter, refusing to supply a single letter even where he *must* have known *certainly* what was omitted. To think of such servility as elsewhere supplying or omitting words and clauses, opening and closing wide chasms, and reconstructing sentences, appears preposterous.

In vs. 18 G has ^{per unius iustitiam} διενου το δικαιωμα, but F διενου και δικαιωμα (*per unius iustitiam*). No natural explanation can be given of this supplacement of το by και, if F be copied from G.

In the Augiensis this chapter (5) closes, and chap. 6 begins, thus:
 ημων nostrum

ιουν ερευμεν. επι μενω [Q]uid ergo dicemus permanere
 The [Q] is *recentissima manu*. But in G the ημων closes a line and
quid ergo
 the next line begins with Τι ουν, no space being left. Is it not visible that F is copying, but not copying G? Else why the blank? Why the omitted T and Q? Why the ημων placed in a line by itself,

when there is ample space in the line above of only 16 letters? Similar phenomena, sometimes even more striking, occur in nearly every page; as at 6:11; 6:18; 6:23; 7:4; 7:6; 7:20; 7:25; 8:12, *et passim*.

In 7:8, 9 there is in F before Υμω a mark Ζ. We do not know what it means, unless a blank in some ancestor, but there is nothing in G to suggest it.

In 8:17 G reads:

et c haeredes autem christi
καὶ. κληρονόμοι δε χρῶ κ. τ. λ.

But F,

καὶ. κληρο νομοι. *et heredes. heredes quidem*
δε χρῶ. *di. coheredes autem xpi.*

Here it is manifest that F has not been guided by G. But some one may say that he has left the blank to bring about correspondence with his Latin text. This we cannot, indeed, disprove, yet it is improbable. For at 1 Cor. 1:27 just such a case arises, where the Latin is fuller than the Greek. What does F do? Leave a blank? Not at all. He goes straight forward with the Greek, inserts the Latin words (about twenty) in the Latin lines, lengthening them considerably, indicates the insertion by the superposed marks ∴, ÷, ∴, and writes in the Greek margin *de est in greco*. We hold, then, that F represents his Greek prototype at 8:17.

In 8:20 we read:

vanitati enim creatura subjecta est non volens
Τη γὰρ ματαιότη τη ηκτισεισ υπεταγη ου θελουσα
δεχεται. τη. γαρ. ματαιοτη. *lat. Vanitati autem*
τη. η. κατσεισ. υπεταγη. ου *creatura subjecta est non*

It seems plain that F is groping his way with exceeding caution, but utterly in the dark. Neither he nor G understands what he is writing, but the former is lost as apparently is impossible with the latter to guide him. This fact comes out most broadly in η. κατσεισ, which

creatura
no one can derive from ηκτισεισ. Undoubtedly F had before him ΗΚΑΤΙΣΕΙΣ. Herein he recognized correctly the article Η, though probably not *as* the article. The ΚΑ he perhaps thinks is for ΚΑΙ; the rest he lets stand. But whence came the ΚΑ? We answer, it was the blunder of an earlier scribe, who mistook the simple Κ, perhaps accidentally written with a small down-stroke, Κ̣, for the tachygraphic

symbol K=KA. This explanation seems satisfactory, but our cause does not depend upon it or upon any other; we maintain merely that the passage in F is plainly not transcribed from G.

In 7:19 we read:

<i>volo facio bonum sed quod malum hoc ago si autem</i>	
Θελω ποιω. αγαθον Αλλο. κακον τουτο πρασσω	Ει δε
<i>qd volo facio bonum. sed quod</i>	Ο. θελω. ποιω αγαθον. αλλο
<i>odio malum illud ago</i>	μεισω. κακον. του. το πρασσω.

Whence comes the *μεισω*? Certainly not from G. True, F might have looked back a page, to vs. 15, and there found *αλλο μεισω τουτο* and *sed quod odio illud facio*. But it seems in the last degree unlikely that he would do so, and even unlikelier still that he would dare modify his Greek to suit his Latin. We recall the admission of Zimmer (p. 472) and the fact that nowhere can it be proved or made probable that F's Greek has been conformed to his Latin. The only natural supposition is that he is transcribing literally. That he is not following G is still further evident from the false division of *του.το*, which seems impossible to a reader of G, and that he is following some other prototype is seen in the position of *ο* at the beginning of a line in F, but at the end in G, *although* the preceding line in F is rather short than long.

In 9:9 there is in G a blank space, one-fourth of a line, before *λογιζεται*, but none in F. At 9:14 we read in G:

num quid iniquitas apud deum
Μη αδικεια παρα Θω

But in F,

<i>uid ergo dicemus. numquid iniqui</i>	Τι ουν. ερουμεν. μη. αδικει.
<i>tas apud dm. absit</i>	απαρ. Θω. μη. γενοιτο. Τω.

We call especial attention to this instance. The deliberation with which the *α* is misplaced seems *absolutely impossible* in the presence of G. That F is following his pattern *exactly* is clear as noonday. That pattern began a paragraph at this point, as is proved by the *Q* dropped from *Quid*. Also the writer of the pattern knew that the *α* before *παρα* belonged to the preceding *αδικει*, as is proved by the fact that he has divided *iniqui-tas* to correspond to *αδικει-α*. That the Latin has been divided in correspondence to the Greek, and not conversely, is proved by the almost exact equality of the Greek lines and the notable inequality of the Latin. *But the F scribe understood none of these things*, hence his sense-destroying interpunctuation.

At 9:31 G has:

in legem non pervenit
 εἰς. νομον. οὐκ ἐφθόχεν

But F,

In legem justitiae non

εἰς. νομον + δικαιοσύνησ. οὐκ.

Whence the δικαιοσύνησ? Evidently it is an influx from the margin, as appears in the mark $\div =$ *scilicet*. There it was an explanatory gloss. The only supposition that can save Zimmer's theory is that F* here deliberately introduces the word as a translation of his Latin *justitiae*. Against this we array F's dense ignorance of Greek, as vividly illustrated in vs. 14; also the admission of Zimmer already quoted (p. 472); also the indication in \div that the word has crept in from the margin; lastly, the fact that the addition is by no means peculiar to F, but is powerfully supported by a long list of authorities headed by \aleph^c FKL^p.

At 12:4 we read:

membra autem
 Τα δε μελη

omnia non eundem habet actum
 παντα ου. την. αυτην εχει πραξιν κ. τ. λ.

παντα. μελη. ου την. αυτην.

omnia membra non eundem

πραξιν. εχει. Οὐτως. οι. πολ

habent actum. Ita mul

Here the order of words in the two codices is twice opposed. It is extremely improbable that F has copied from G; for, since μελη ends the line in G, the scribe would naturally have put it down before noticing the παντα in the next line; his only motive for changing the Greek would have been the desire to conform it to the Latin—a motive which never swayed him (*teste* Zimmer), and which certainly was not in general felt. But even if he had felt it, he could easily have used the sigla /·, /·, as is actually done in the next line. Here the case is far clearer. For G's Greek does actually conform to the Latin order, but F's reverses it. Hence there can be no possible motive for F's reversal; it must have been a mere blunder. But such a blunder was most unlikely, as anyone must see on reading G. On the other hand, both the orders in F, especially the second, are sustained by highly respectable ancient authorities.

At 9:33 we read in G and F:

dali et qui crediderit in eo non confunditur
 δαλου και /ο. πιστευων επαυτω ου μη καταισχυνη . . —

επιστευων. επ. αυτω. ου. μη.

qui crediderit ineum non

This case is one of the plainest and most convincing. In order to have produced F from G the scribe must have misread ο as ε, must have failed to note the breathing /, never over ε, must have overlooked the dot and the wide space following ο, and also the translation *qui* both in g and in the original of f. We hold such a concurrence of blunders to be practically impossible. To a transcriber of G there is no occasion for the least confusion. We do not dwell on the monster *επιστευων* further than to ask: Would the creator of such a prodigy, under such conditions, have attempted to improve a plain Greek text that he was copying? If now we inquire after the origin of this error, the answer comes instantly. The scribe saw before him ΙΟΤΙC *continuo scripta*. But the O was faint on the right, and so was mistaken, as so often happens, for Ε; hence the present F text. It seems very difficult, if not impossible, to doubt the correctness of this explanation.

At 15:9 the two texts are:

in gentibus et psallam t cantam. nomini tuo et iterum dicit
 εν. εθνεσιν και ψαλω. τω. ονοματι σου Και παλειν λεγει
et nomini tuo cantabo. σειν; Και. τω. ονοματι. σου. ψαλω

Of course, it is easy to say that F has changed the Greek order, but there is no scintilla of proof that he ever does so; the *evidence* is all the other way. Moreover, the semicolon (;), the capital K, and the bar over ω can none of them come from G, but all point to some other source.

At 15:22 the codices read:

impediebar multum t plurimum venire ad vos ex multis jam
 ενεκοπην πολλακτης του ελθειν προσ υμας. Απο πολλων
 *venire ad vos nunc*
 αιτων ωσανουν πορευομαι. του ελθειν υμας Νυν
vero non ulterius locum habens in partibus tregionibus his
 ειδε μη, κετει τοπον εχων εν τοις κλημασιν τουτοις
desiderium autem habeo veniendi t venire ad vos a mul
 Επειποθειαν. δε εχω του ελθειν προσ υμας Απο πολ
tis annis praecedentibus sed eum proficiscar in hispaniam spe
 λων. αιτων ωσανουν πορευομαι εισ την σπανιον Ελ
ro per circuiens videre , vos et a vobis
 πειζω διαπορευομενος Θεασασθαι υμας Και αφυμων

δι. ο. και. ενεκοτην. πολλακτης. *propter quod et impediēbar plurimum*
 του. ελθειν. προσ. υμας. απο *venire ad vos ex*
 πολλων. αιτων. ωσανυν. *multis jam praecedentibus annis*
 νυν. ειδε. μη. κετειτοπον. *nunc ergo ulterius locum non*
 εχων. εν. τοις. κλημασιν. τουτοις. *habens in regionibus his*

*desiderium autem habeo veniendi
ad vos. Sed cum proficiscar in
ispaniam spero in transitu
videre vos et a vobis*

επειποθειαν. δε. εχω. τον. ελθειν.
προσ. υμας √. πορευομαι. εισ. την.
σπανιαν. ελπειζω. δια. πορευο
μενοσ. θεασασθαι. υμας. καφυμων.

We note that G has deleted Απο π. α. ω. π., but F retains απο. π. α. ω. (with νυν for νουν); also G inserts του ελθειν υμας, but F omits πορευομαι τ. ε. υ.; also G inserts Απο. π. α. ω. before the second πορευομαι, but F omits them.

We pass over minor variations, though not unimportant (as Διο Και and δι. ο. και, Και αφυμων and καφυμων), and ask: Is the likeness photographic? Is it probable that a scribe so ignorant of Greek would have departed so far from his original? Of course, one may always *assert* that F is adapting his Greek to his Latin, but the assertion can never be made even probable. In view of the facts already cited it is unprecedented and beyond belief that he would thus change the text before him, even had his Greek knowledge sufficed. It must be added that the Vulgate of the Codex Amiatinus differs from F at this point widely, so that there is still less reason for imagining the Greek altered to fit the Latin. Some late reviser has inserted the marks √, says Scrivener, *recentissime*.

We have noted only a few of the almost innumerable *indicia* of the non-derivation of F from G that present themselves in Romans; enough, however, to show that they exist, quite as numerous and important in the first as in the last of the epistles. We might here close this line of argument, but that Zimmer professes to have made a special study of Galatians and assures us that there is no sign to be found therein of derivation other than from G, unless perchance it be

the καμοι of F instead of καμοι in G (2:8). This instance he considers, and rightly finds inconclusive. Just here one is astonished at the punctilious conscientiousness of our critic. Surely such scrupulosity must have its reward, at least in our absolute confidence in his scientific fair-mindedness. But alack! on closer scrutiny our trust is rudely shaken. Firstly, it is not quite correct that F* has deviated one iota from G; it is only F** that has written the ι above the line. This, however, is the merest trifle, but it serves well to show how carefully Zimmer strains out a gnat—only to swallow a whole drove of camels. For grave discrepancies between F and G abound in Galatians, and it is these that Zimmer has forgot to mention.

A striking example is afforded by this very passage (2:8):

cut petrus circumcisionis operatus est t mihi inter
 θωσ πετροσ της περιτομης ενηργησεν καμοι εισ
 ασ. καθωσ. πετρο. περιτομης. εν. *sicut petro circumcisionis*

ηργησεν. καμοι. εισ. τα. εθνην *operatus est et mihi intergentes.*

Here the correct form πετρο(ω) is given against the πετροσ of G; also της is omitted. Of course one can still *assert* that F is molding his Greek on his Latin last, but this remains *mere assertion*, neither will it explain the omission of της.

In 2 : 9 F has ^στεσ τυλοι for G's τεσ στυλοι. The loss of the σ is easy to understand if F be copied from a MS., *continuo scripta*, since then the two σ's would meet; but not if F be taken from G, where the σ's are distinctly apart.

In 3 : 17 we find :

dei in christum quod post cccctos et xxx annos facta est lex
 Θυ εισ χρν ο. μετα υ, και α αιτη γεγονωσ. νο
 Ο. μετα. υ. και. λ. αιτη. γεγω *quae post cccc et xxx annos facta*

Here G has mistaken Λ for Α; did F know enough about Greek notation to correct him? Did F know that λ stood for 30 in Greek? We cannot believe it.

ⁱⁿ
 In 3 : 23 G has εισ την correctly and widely separated; but F has εστιν! Three variations and the sense annulled, in spite of the *in* written above! If F so cautiously and so often corrects his Greek by his Latin, why did he not let his Latin (*in eam fidem*) here keep him true to his original?

Immediately after Θηναι (vs. 23) F leaves a blank space of nearly a line, but G leaves none at all.

quam eius quae t habent
 In 4 : 27 G has ης της ερημου εχου, but F omits ερημου; why? Because the Latin above is underscored? This seems an insufficient reason.

In 5 : 6 there stands :

neque praeputium sed fides per t ex caritatem
 Ουτε ακροβυστια Αλλα πιστις δια αγαπησ
 ουτε ακροβυστια *neque circumcisio aliquid va*
let. Neque prepuccium
 αλλα. πιστις. δια. αγαπησ. ενερ *sed fides quae per caritatem ope*

Here it seems evident that F is following his original. He is not adapting Greek to Latin, since the ακροβυστια corresponds, not to *circumcisio*, but to *prepuccium*.

From 5:21 we may learn how and how far F does adapt his Greek and Latin to each other: he has dotted pairs of corresponding words.

In 5:23 F omits $\Theta\iota$ at the beginning, but has correctly *spiritu ambulemus* $\pi\upsilon\iota$ $\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\chi\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$; but G has $\pi\upsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\iota\chi\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$. Can Zimmer explain the falling away of G's $\Theta\iota$ or the transference of ϵ to the $\tau\omicron\iota\chi\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$?

In 6:17 we find clear proof of two facts; the interlineations are not, at least are not all, taken from G; for the words *laboris mihi nemo exhibeat*, written over $\kappa\omicron\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\ .\ \mu\omicron\iota\ .\ \mu\eta\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ .\ \pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\chi\epsilon\tau\omega\ .$, are not in g, which agrees with f (*nemo mihi molestus sit*). Also the scribe has no thought of conforming Greek and Latin to each other, for we read:

$\tau\alpha\ .\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ .\ \kappa\upsilon\ .\ \eta\mu\omega\nu\ .\ \upsilon\ .\ \chi\upsilon\ .\ \epsilon\nu\ .\ \tau\omega\ .\ \quad \quad \quad \overline{i\hbar u\ in}$

And again in vs. 18 $\tau\omicron\nu\ \overline{\chi\upsilon}$, but $\overline{d\eta\iota}$, while G has $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$. Here F *departs* from G and from *his own Latin* at the same time.

When to the foregoing we add the important variant in 5:10, already discussed, we see that the divergences between F and G, even in Galatians, are by no means inconsiderable, but indicate unmistakably that G is not the archetype of F. We are not afraid, then, to rest our case even on Galatians, where the discrepancies happen to be least; nevertheless, as Zimmer has chosen this epistle, we too may make some choice; let it be the immediately following Ephesians. Of course, we can notice only the more signal divergences.

In 1:11 G has $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\eta\theta\eta\mu\epsilon\nu$, but F $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\eta\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu$. The $\sigma\alpha$ has been deleted by dots, but that is not to the point, which is: How could F* insert the $\sigma\alpha$ if copying the G text? We can imagine no answer, for there can be no question of eye-wandering, as there is no $\sigma\alpha$ in the neighborhood, and the G text is in the first line of its page. To be sure, one might ask: How could such a mistake be made in any case? We answer that we cannot tell when, or where, or how it was made, whether by F* or F' or F'', because we do not know what appearance the originals presented to the copyist; if we did, the explanation might be simple enough. What we do know is that such a blunder is quite unintelligible in transcribing the text of G.

futuro
In 1:21 G has $\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\iota$. It would seem impossible for anyone to make any mistake, if exercising the least care. But F has $\mu\epsilon\ \alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\iota$. It is inconceivable that anyone could have so transcribed the G text. The Latin written above positively forbids anyone to resolve the word into $\mu\epsilon$ and anything else. In this case, moreover, the mistake of F is perfectly comprehensible. The text before him was $\tau\omega\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\iota$.

He recognized and spaced off the ΤΩ, and thought he recognized also the ΜΕ, which accordingly he spaced off. The first Λ he mistook for Α, as so often happens; but he seems almost instantly to have discovered his mistake and deleted the α; then he wrote off the other letters, doubtless not understanding them. The και, of course, he recognized and hence set off as a word.

In 2:1 G has τοις παραπτωμασιν, but F τον.παραπτωμασιν. This solecism is interesting, as disclosing F's impenetrable ignorance of Greek; but how did it originate? Hardly from G, who writes τοις. But if the text before F read ΤΟΙC, then if the lower half of the C was a little dim, one might easily read ΤΟΥ.

In 2:2 we meet with an entirely different phenomenon:

<i>tis in</i> νντοσ εν. κ.τ.λ. <i>huius spiritus. qui nunc opera</i> <i>tur etc.</i>	<i>opera</i> εν εργο τουτου. π̄νσ. του. ννν. ενεργον το. κ.τ.λ.
---	--

How excessively unlikely that F should not copy down, but look away from the ο, at the end of the line in G, back to the ν at the beginning of the next line, and then combine these two letters, nearly a foot apart in G, into the one symbol ϝ, which is scarcely used! Especially as he was at the end of his own line! We need not dwell on his omission of the final C (in τος); that was perhaps due to confusion, the result of the proximity of C in the original to the following Ε.

In 2:5 G has:

gratia estis saluati t salvi facti
χαριτι εσται σεσωσμενοι.

From this unmistakable original how could F produce

.σ.
τι. εσταισεωσμενοι. και. συν?

In 2:15, 16 there are several strange diversities on which we cannot dwell. At the close of vs. 18 the line is blank in F thus:

<i>patrem</i>	πατερα.
---------------	---------

There is no blank in G.

In 2:19, 20 we find

<i>sanctorum et</i> των. αγιων και οικειοι του Θ̄ν̄ εποι κοδομηθεντες επι τω θεμελιω τω. αγιων. κ̄ οικει. οιτχ. Θ̄ν̄. εποικο δομηθεντες. επι. τω. θεμελω.	<i>scorum et domestici di super aedificati supra fundamentum</i>
---	--

Here the omission of ν , giving the impossible $\tau\omega$, is hard to understand from G, but not from F' (or F"), in which the word was doubtless written $\overline{\tau\omega}$; the stroke — was merely forgotten, overlooked, or disregarded. And how shall we understand from G the misdivision in $\text{οικει. οιδ}\delta$? We pass by the ι for η and the ι omitted.

In 2:21 we have in G $\alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$, but in F $\alpha\omega\nu$, though \overline{scm} in the Latin. G's $\alpha\Gamma\text{ION}$ is not easy to misgrasp, especially with *sanctum* above it, but the words ΑΓION and ΑΙΩΝ might be confounded in close or shorthand writing, though hardly, we think, by F*, but by some predecessor.

In 3:4 the ολιπω in F is hard to derive from the ολλιγω in G. This chap. iii begins with Τουτου in G, but with ουτου in F—another omission of an initial, wholly inexplicable on Zimmer's hypothesis.

In 3:9 G has $\alpha\omega\nu\omega\nu$ *p. m.*, $\alpha\omega\nu\omega\nu$ *s. m.*, but F has $\alpha\omega\nu\omega$ ^{ν} . Here the bar in F's original $\bar{\omega}$ has been disregarded, correction being made afterward.

In 3:28 we read:

	<i>sic et viri</i>	
	$\text{Οντωσ και οι. ανδρεσ}$	
<i>debent diligere</i>	<i>suas uxores ut</i>	
$\text{οφιλουσιν. αγαπαν τας εαυτων γυναικας Ωσ τα}$		
<i>lata. Ita et viri de</i>	$\text{μοσ. Ον τωσ. και οι. ανδρει. σοφι}$	
<i>bent delegere uxores</i>	$\text{λουσιν. αγαπαντας. εαυτων. γυ}$	

Here the case seems clear as day. F has taken ανδρει for a word, he has prefixed the σ to οφιλουσιν , making the familiar syllable σοφ . This was perfectly natural, if his text was $\text{ΑΝΔΡΕΙ} \overline{\text{COΦΙΛΟΥCIN}}$, but it is all forever incomprehensible if G lay before him—both the false division, and the omission of the ϵ , and the transference of the σ .

With this we close our examination of Ephesians. The mind that is unmoved by this last example would hardly be moved by any other.

But there is not one epistle that does not present such phenomena. Thus, in Phil. 2:17:

<i>immolor supra sacrificium et servitutem t obsequium</i>	<i>fidei</i>
$\text{πενδομαι επι τη. θυσια και λειτουγια της πιστεωσ}$	
<i>vestrae gaudeo et congratulor</i>	
$\text{υμων χαιρω. και συνχαιρω κ.τ.λ.}$	
$\text{και. ει. σπενδομαι. επι. τη. θυ}$	<i>et si immolor supra sacrifici</i>
$\text{σια. και. λειτουργια. της. πιστε}$	<i>um et obsequium fidei</i>
$\text{ωσ. υμ. χαιρω. και. συν}$	<i>vestrae. gaudeo et con gratu</i>

Here we must note the wrong division in G, corrected in F; but even if F was equal to such a feat (which is impossible, since he has not comprehended the word, but has falsely divided it), how shall we explain the presence of the ρ in *τουργῖα*? F has not understood the rare word and naturally has misdivided it; why then did he, and *how then could he*, correct G's false spelling by inserting ρ ? Impossible! And why did he circumflex the ι , uncircumflexed in G? But this is not all. The contraction of *υμων* into $\overline{\upsilon\mu}$ seems very strange for F, so feeble in Greek, and in fact almost impossible, for the word is not elsewhere contracted; especially as there is no occasion whatever, the line being a short one. We must refer the contraction to some ancestor of F, in which the word occurred at the end of a line probably, and there was contracted, as is very common.

non quae

In Col. 3:2 G presents *μη τα*, but F has *.μεγα.* in spite of *non quae* in f. Such a mistake in copying G seems to press close on the bounds of the possible. However, MHTA might easily be misread as MHΓA, if the left half of the horizontal bar was obscure, and the confusion of E and H is one of the most frequent of itacisms, made centuries before.

In 1 Thess. 1:1 we read:

<i>paulus et silvanus et timotheus</i> Παυλος και σιλβανος και τιμοθεος PAULUS et <i>Silvanus</i> <i>et timotheus ecclesiae</i>	Παυλος. και λ σια βανος. και. τιμωθεος. τη. εκκλησῖα
---	---

Here the false division and the mistake of λ for α appear downright impossible to a copyist of G; but not to one whose original was C1ABANOC.

On the next page of F the confusion of ϵ and η is worse confounded than ever; there seems to be no explanation in G.

quam sancti

In 2:10 G has π . Ωσ *οσιωσ*, but F *προσ. αγῖος*. If this be photographic likeness, the camera would seem to have been sadly out of focus.

In 2:14 F puts a comma at the close of the line, thus: *.των*, and then leaves half the next line vacant before *και. τον. κν. απεκτι*. There is nothing in G or in the Latin f to suggest or explain this blank; it must have been present in the original of F.

In 4 : 13, after a blank occupied by five >'s, G has

^{no}
Ου

^{lumus}

θελομεν. F has no blank, but begins a line thus :

^a *Nolumus autem vos ignorare* ^μ Μυθελομεν. δε. ὑμας. αγνοειν

We cannot be sure how this confusion of O and M (or of ου and μη) originated, but everything seems done in F with deliberation, and the derivation from G seems impossible. Notice, too, the small *n* and *μ*; these were placed there as catch letters, showing what letters were to be filled in *after*. F has faithfully copied everything.

In 2 Thess. 2 : 1 a precisely similar case is seen; G has ^{rogamus} Ερωτωμεν, but F (at the beginning of a line) π Πρωτωμεν. The Ε of G could not be misread as Π. The source of the error cannot be found in G, but must be sought in F', which therefore is not G.

Similarly, in 3 : 1 we find Λοιπον in G, but in F the impossible π Ποιπον, in spite of *Decetero* in the Latin (f). Here again G is not the copy set before F.

In 1 Cor. 6 : 15 G has

^{faciam membra meretricis}
Ποιησω μελη πορνησ.

^{absit}

^{an tollens ergo}

Μη γεν.οιτο before H. αρα ουν, but those five words are omitted by F. The old evasion is that F is here adapting Greek to Latin, but there is no ground for this claim; in a thousand other cases they are left at variance.

^{an t aut}

At 6 : 6 G has H at the end of a line and ουκ οιδατε beginning the next. F writes Ηγκ.οιδατε.

At 9 : 6 G has :

^{barna}
και. βαρνα

^{non habemus}

βας ουκ εχομεν;

but F

^{βα}

κ. βαρνα. σ. ε. ζκ εχομεν εξον

et barnabas non habemus potesta

How could anyone produce this in copying G? How overlook the βα in βασ, at the beginning of a line? Why put a period? Whence the ε? Is it not plain that the βα omitted points to some misunderstood contraction? that the ε has arisen from some confusion of C and O, between which uncials it stood? The symbol of contraction ξ was almost certainly present in F'.

^{neque murmuravunt}

In 1 Cor. 10 : 10 G has Μηδε γογγυζωμεν at the end of a line; but F has at the bottom of p. 2, folio 44 :

perierunt. Neque murmurave *απωλοντο. Μη. δε. γογγυζω*
 and at the top of the next, p. 1, folio 45,
μεν. καθοσ. τεινεσ. αυτων. *ritis sicut quidam eorum*

If F copied from G, then the scribe stopped needlessly at the bottom of the page, three letters from the end of a line in G, in the middle of a word, when there was ample space for *μεν* in his line, and then carried this *μεν* forward to the top of the next page! Is this in the lowest degree likely? Common-sense answers, No! It is psychologically almost impossible.

In 12:13 G has ^{greci} *Αληνεσ*, but F ^{greci} *ελληνεσ*. Did a scribe so densely ignorant of Greek know and dare to correct his original thus? We cannot believe it. F** has written *greci* above, since *gentiles* appears in f. How shall we explain G's blunder? Most probably the Α is for Λ and the Ε has been omitted, as so often, from the margin. We are thus carried back, not to G', but to G". The clear indication is that F and G have not the same original.

In 15:35 we find:

	<i>mortui</i>
	οι νεκ
<i>quali autem corpore veniunt insipiens tu quod</i>	
ροι. Ποιω δε σωματι ερχονται. Αφρων συ ο.	
<i>seminas non vivificatur nisi prius moriatur</i>	
σπειρεισ ου ζωοποιεται εαν μη πρωτον αποθανη	
<i>mortui. quali autem corpore venient.</i>	κροι. ποιω. δε. σωματι. ερχονται
αφρων. συ. οσ. πειρεισ. ου ζωοποι	<i>insipiens tu quod seminas. non vivi</i>
εται. εαν. μη. πρωτον. αποθανη	<i>ficatur. Nisi prius moriatur.</i>

Can any unbiased mind believe that F* would without any ground omit the κ at the end of the line and prefix it to the beginning of the next? That he could change the correct and unmistakable ο. σπειρεισ into the unmeaning οσ πειρεισ, in spite of the translation above? in spite of the period after ο? in spite of the fact that the ο and the σ are separated by nearly a foot?

In 15:49 we read:

igitur sicut portavimus
αρα Καθωσ εφορεσαμεν κ.τ.λ.
Αρα. καθωσ. εφορεσαμεν την. ικονα *Igitur sicut portavimus imaginem*

It is improbable and unprecedented that the ignorant scribe should transfer the *Αρα* from the margin into the text.

In 16:6 the texts stand:

pertransiero nam Macedoniam enim pertransibo

διελθὼ Μακαιδονίαν γὰρ διερχομαι κ.τ.λ.

ero. Nam macedoniam ptransibo

θω. Μακαιδονίαν. δε διερχομαι.

Here we have an entirely different reading, δε for γὰρ. All possibility of mistaking the last for the first is here positively excluded. Moreover, here at last the subterfuge, that F is adapting his Greek to his Latin, is wholly unavailable, for the Latin has *nam*, which may render the γὰρ of G, but not the δε of F. Neither, then, by accident nor by design can the F text be derived from G.

But someone may say that certainly at some time the variation originated, and why not as well when F was written as at any other date? We answer: This is not the place to discuss in general the subject of New Testament variants; it is enough to say that we may without great difficulty understand their origin at a much earlier period, when the scribes were themselves good Grecians; when they had their own independent opinions about grammar and logic, and even dogma and history; when they dared express such opinions, unawed by hoary tradition and theories of canonicity and verbal inspiration. But the case is altogether another in the midnight of the ninth century, when the scribes were deplorably ignorant of Greek, of its syntax, its inflections, its orthography; when they could not even divide it into words properly, and when the Holy Writ was shielded from profanation by the inviolable sanctity of centuries.

In 2 Cor. 1:1 the two codices read:

paulus apostolus iesu christi per voluntatem dei et

Παυλος αποστολος ιω χυ δια θεληματος θυ και

Paulus Appls.

Παυλος. αποστολος.

per voluntatem Di

δια. Θεληματος. Θυ.

Here the case is plain on its face. The omission of ιω χυ, whether by accident or by design, seems out of the question. Whatever we may say of F, the Latin (f) here certainly represents an old form, in our judgment most probably an older form than either of the others (with χυ ιω and ιω χυ) that divide nearly equally the suffrages of authorities.

2 Cor. 2:1 begins thus:

statis iudicavi t statui autem hoc ipsum apud

εστηκατα. [Εκρινα δε εμαυτω με

hoc ipsum

τουτο. κ.τ.λ. ^{στατισ} _{εστηκατα}

εστηκατα. Εκρινα. δε. εμαυ

statis. Statui autem hoc ipsum

τω. τοῦτο. Το. μη. παλιν. εν. λυπη.

apud ut non intristitia ve

Here the splitting of *εμαντω* at the end of a line itself not full is unintelligible in copying from G, where the word ends the line. Notice also the breathings on the *υ*'s, not in G—an evidence of the great painstaking of the scribe. The passage is also interesting as showing by its *me* what is otherwise abundantly evident, that the Greek in G was written before the Latin (g).

In 2 Cor. 5:12 G has *καυχηματος*, but F has *.κ.χηματος*, with *gloriandi* in f. Here it seems clear as noon that F is not copying from G, whose *αν* could not be mistaken, but from a MS. in which *καν* was abbreviated into K with some following slight mark which F did not understand. The interlinear *αν* is, of course, a subsequent correction.

In 2 Cor. 5:1 the MSS. read :

huius habitationis desolatur quod habitaculum ex deo habemus domum non manufactam aeternam in
 του σκηνοσ καταλυθη. Οτι οικοδομην εκ θυ εχ
 ομεν οικιαν ουκ αχιροποιητον. Αιωνιον εν. τοις
solvatur. qd. aedificationem ex Θη. οτι. οικοδομην. εκ. Θυ. εχο
dō habemus. domum non manufactam μεν. οικιαν. ουκ. αχιρο, πι ητον

Is this likeness "photographic?" Can any reason be assigned for the transposition of the *ο*? Is it not plain that the F scribe cannot read the splendid rare word *αχιροποιητον*?

In 2 Cor. 5:17 G has *καινη κτισις* at the beginning of the line, at the top of the page, but F has :

in xpo nova creatura. Ve *ειτεισ. εν. xρω. και. νηκτισισ. τα.*

Was such an amazing misconception possible to a copyist of G? Has not F* picked out his letters one by one from a MS. *continuo scripta* and fancied he has found the inevitable *και*?

In 1 Tim. 1:9 G has quite unmistakably *Αλλ ανομοιοστε*; but F has *αλλανομοιοσ. τε*. It seems impossible for anyone to fail to observe that the *Αλλ* has been deleted in G both by dots and by the transverse stroke (here omitted).

The fund of examples like the foregoing seems almost inexhaustible; not so, however, the patience of the reader. We have taken specimens from every one of the thirteen epistles. Any one of more than a score seems to us practically decisive. If any mind remains yet unmoved by their collected force, such a mind is not sensible to considerations of such nature; it would find some means to smooth away

any discrepancies whatever between isolated passages in the codices, no matter how sharp or how numerous they might be. It would seem useless, therefore, to develop this phase of the investigation any further.

But even such an intelligence must, we think, yield to the strength of the evidence we are now about to bring forward—evidence of an entirely different character, derived not from any particular passage, but from the general structure of the codices as wholes. We now affirm :

That in their lineation the Greek and Latin (F and f) are adjusted to each other with the minutest accuracy, with punctilious care. This fact stares at us from every page, and almost from every line. The quotations already given have exemplified it a hundred times. Not only are the words matched line by line, but the syllables as well. When the Greek word is divided, so too is the Latin, almost invariably. Of course, the differences in the structure of the two languages, especially the absence of articles and the weaker verbal inflection in the Latin, render the *absolute* and *uniform* matching of the endings impossible. To test our assertion we throw F open at random, at fol. 22, p. 2, and give the words divided at the ends of lines, the dash denoting division :

recon-ciliacionem, κα-ταλλαγή; *as-sumtio*, προ-λημψις; *in-sert* . . . εν-εκεν . . . ; *ra-dix*, ρει-ζα; *frac-ti sunt*, κλασ-θησαν; *in-serar*, εν-κεντρισθω; *incredu-litate*, απισ-τεια; *altum-sapere*, υψη-λοφρονει; *ra-mis*, κλα-δων; επιμειγω-σειν, *permanse-rint*; ενκεντρισ-θησονται, *inse-rentur*; εξ-εκοπησ, *ex-cisus es*; μαλ-λον, *ma-gis*; εν-κεν . . . , *in-serentur*; αγνο-ειν, *igno-rare*; μυστηρει-ον, *mysteri-um*; πωρω-σεις, *cae-citas*; πληρωμα, *pleni-tudo*; σωθησ-εται, *salvus-erit*; Ηξ-ει, *veni-et*.

Twenty-one examples on two pages !

We have trusted our case to a random opening of the Codex ; pages much more strikingly illustrative might be found, but these are conclusive in their testimony. We do not dwell on this proposition ; anyone may easily test it for himself, and perhaps no one will dispute it. Either, then, the Latin lines have been adapted to the Greek, or the Greek have been adapted to the Latin. We affirm :

The Latin lines have been adapted to the Greek, and not the Greek to the Latin. This proposition is, on its face, very plausible ; it would be strange if the original should be fitted to a translation, and not the translation to the original. That the Greek *leads* is shown by

the fact that it is placed *first* (on the left) on the first page of each folio. More than this, however; the proposition is proved incontestably by a variety of considerations. First, the Greek lines are in each column almost uniform in length; the slight variations are doubtless due in large measure to contractions and to the varying size of the letters in the ancestral MSS.; the number of letters line by line varies within narrow limits. Thus, opening *Augiensis* at random, fol. 75, p. 2, we find the longest line has twenty-five letters, the shortest has twenty-one; but the longest Latin line has thirty-four letters, the shortest has only fifteen. Everywhere, in fact, the Latin lines are most irregular. The number of letters vibrates between the widest extremes. There are many more striking examples than this afforded by our random choice, but this is quite sufficient. Indeed, a mere glance at almost any page must convince the unprejudiced mind that the Greek lines have been made of nearly uniform length, while the Latin fitted thereto are wholly irregular. No one will maintain that the Latin could have been independently chosen irregularly so as to give a regular result in Greek.

When we come to particular lines, the case appears, if possible, even stronger still. There are hosts of examples where it is preposterous to suppose the Latin determined the Greek. Thus, on the very next page, 1 of fol. 76, we find:

τα. του. κυ. ημων. υν. χυ. εν. τω. *ihu. in*

—a normal Greek line, but a Latin one of only five letters. On the next page, as one of many:

rare omnia in *κεφελεωσασθαι τα. παντα. εντω.*

On p. 183:

εκθρουσ. του. σταυρου. του. χρυ. *cos crucis xpi*

But on p. 185:

σα. προσ φειλη. οσα. ευφημα *quae cumque amabilia quae cūque bonae famae*

On p. 193:

σει. ουμενοσ. υπο. του. νοοσ *status sensu*

But on p. 199:

ρω. γαρ. αυτω. οτι. εχει. πολιν *um enim illi perhibeo qd̄ habeat multum*

On p. 231:

οβασιλευσ. των. βασιλεοντων *rex regum et*

But on p. 224 :

justificatum est in spir̄ ar̄paruit ange^{lis} ωθη. εν. πνι. ωφθη. αγγελισ.

On p. 33 :

κεντριστησονται. τη. ιδεια *serentur suae*
ελαια *olivae*

This is of itself conclusive. There was plain reason for writing the Greek so; the line was full—twenty-two letters; there was no reason whatever for writing the Latin so, except to fit it to the Greek. There are scores of such instances. Thus on p. 12 :

Servi facti estis justitiae ει. δουλωθηται της δικαιοσυνη.

and on p. 209 :

αλληλους. εν. τοις. λογοις. του *invicem. In verbis*
τοις. *istis*

But on p. 7 :

ημων εν χρυ δι ου νυν. *nrm ihm xpm per ihm xpm per quem*

As secondary, the Latin is natural; as primary, it is unimaginable. Such examples may be accumulated by the hundred; on the other hand, there are no cases where any adaptation of the Greek to the Latin is clearly indicated. The length of the Latin lines is sometimes so excessive that unusual contractions and other devices become necessary, as on pp. 39, 69, 75. But perhaps the most curious illustration of this punctilious adjustment of Latin to Greek is found in Gal. 5 : 9 :

Θεσθαι. Η. πισμονη. ουκ. εκτοΥ *ritis. Persuasio non est ex eo qui vo-*
καλουντος. υμας. Μικρα. ζυ *cat vos. Modicum fermen-*
μη. ολον. το. φυραμα. ζυμοι. *tum totam massam corrumpit.*

Here *tum* has been erased after *fermen* in the second line and placed at the beginning of the third. No other motive seems assignable than the desire to match the divided ζυ-μη with the divided *fermen-tum*.

The question now arises : Who has made this division of the Greek letters into lines of practically uniform length, and who has adapted thereto the division of the Latin letters and with such extreme care ? A positive answer may perhaps never be possible, but a negative one is even now certain : *it was not the F scribe*. For such a division of the Latin, to accord so exactly with the Greek, pre-supposes at least a respectable knowledge of the latter, a knowledge far transcending

what F* displays in dividing into words near the middle of the line. It cannot be that a scribe should show himself grossly ignorant of a tongue in the middle of the lines, but well-versed in it at the ends. Besides, the utter disregard of the Latin in writing the Greek is conspicuous on nearly every page. That F is not guided by his Latin in grouping his Greek letters is vivid in 2 Cor. 5:17:

in xpō nova creatura. Ve

ειπεισ. εν. χρω. και. νηκτισισ. τα.

It seems impossible that he should not recognize the correspondence of *in xpō* to *εν. χρω*; also he must have known that *και* = *et*; hence he cannot have tried to divide *καινηκτισισ* so as to translate *nova creatura*; and yet he must have known and felt that *nova creatura* represented *καινηκτισισ*, if he was carrying along both Latin and Greek in his consciousness. The only way to understand the phenomenon is to suppose that he was picking out his Greek letters one by one from a MS. written continuously, and with little or no assistance from the Latin.

Moreover, the division of the Greek itself is in many cases inexplicable as the work of the F scribe. Thus, opening the codex at random at the fol. 75, p. 1, we find a line of twenty-one letters, shorter by three or four spaces than the adjacent lines:

κοινωνιω. δε. ο. κατεχουμε

communicet autem is qui catezizatur

Why was the final syllable *νοσ* carried forward to the next line, when it would merely have filled out the line itself? Turning back two leaves we find at Gal. 4:25:

εστιν. αγαρ. Το. γαρ. σινα. οροσ. εστιν

εν. τη. αραβια. η. συνστοι.

Here the case lies open on the hand. The first line is full, having twenty-two letters, at *οροσ*; also, the line in G ends with *οροσ*. The next line is short, having only eighteen letters. Why then should *εστιν* be taken out of the next line in G and almost wedged into this line, raising the number of its letters to the excessive sum of twenty-seven, whereas had it been kept, as was so natural, on the next line, each would have had twenty-two (three)? The reason of the fact seems past finding out so long as we suppose F* himself making the divisions, and perversely inscrutable so long as we imagine him copying from G. But it is easy to understand, if we suppose the division made long centuries before, on the basis of a contracted form of the repeated *εστιν*. Such cases are without number, many of them more vivid than these

just considered. We must conclude, then, that the line-division is not original with F.

This conclusion is corroborated mightily, and, as it seems to us, beyond all possibility of debate, by the distribution into paragraphs. This latter has been carried out, at least in parts of F, with great minuteness and with considerable intelligence. Thus, in Romans, sure tokens of such paragraphy are found at 3:21; 4:1; 4:9; 5:1; 5:15b; 5:18; 5:20; 6:1; 6:12; 6:15; 6:19; 7:1; 7:4; 7:7; 7:21; 7:25b; 8:12; 8:26; 8:28; 8:31; 8:35; 8:37; 9:1; 9:6; and so on. In 1 Corinthians at 1:9; 4:1; 5:1; 6:1; 7:1; 7:25; 8:1; 8:9; 9:4; 9:24; 10:18; and so on. In 2 Corinthians at 2:12; 4:7; 6:11; 7:5; and elsewhere. In Galatians at least at 3:24. In Ephesians at 2:19; 3:1; 4:1; 6:23. In Philippians at 2:19; 4:4. In Colossians at 2:20; 3:12. In 1 Thessalonians at 4:1; 4:13; 5:1; 5:12. In 2 Thessalonians at 2:1; 3:6. In 1 Timothy at 1:8; 1:18; 3:8. In 2 Timothy at 1:10; 4:1; 4:17. In Titus at 2:1; 2:6; 3:1. In Philemon at vs. 17. There are many others, about which we may be confident, but not quite certain.

Now these divisions, be it observed in passing, do not at all correspond to the divisions in G, which are indicated by such marks as >>>. Hence it seems extremely unlikely that either codex should be copied from the other, or, in fact, that they should both have the same proximate original. Furthermore, it is superfluously manifest that F* is not the author of these divisions. For in a large number of cases the initial letter of the paragraph has been omitted in Greek or in Latin, or in both. In some cases space has been left for a capital. In a few cases this letter has been inserted in brackets by a much later hand. We have already discussed several examples of these phenomena, among the most important that arrest our attention in the study of this codex. To us the whole body of such facts appears quite incomprehensible, save only on the hypothesis that F has been copied (mediately or immediately) from a MS. in which these paragraphs were signalized by capitals written most probably in the margin, as in D, and perhaps ornately, in brilliant inks. Such letters would naturally be left unwritten at first, to be filled in afterward, and in some cases might be forgotten or overlooked and so might fall out altogether. Clear indications of such a course of events yet survive in our codex. In several cases a very small letter is found in the margin opposite the same letter capitalized in the text. Thus, to cite an instance not hitherto mentioned, at Phil. 2:19, as the last line of fol. 88, p. 1, we have:

^{ραι.σαι. μοι.}
 ε Ελπίζω. δε, εν. ^{χω. ιην.} τειμο *mini mihi.*
 S Spero autem in dno ihu timo

Here the small letters seem plainly intended as guides for the later insertions. They were certainly copied from F's archetype. For in F the capitals are only slightly distinguished from the common letters. We cannot think of anyone's leaving a blank to be filled in so insignificantly. In the example given above there is no space left blank in G, there is no comma after δε, and no η in ιν. In several cases both the small letter and the initial are wrong, where the G text is correct and altogether unmistakable. Thus at 1 Thess. 4:1:

^{αυτου}
 ιν Πουπον. ουν. ^{αδελφου.} ερωτωμεν. *ejus.*
 d Decetero ergo frs. rogamus

Here there is no space left in G (whose line closes with αδελφοι), no new paragraph, and the Λουπον is unequivocal. In a word, for none of the singularities in question is there to be found anywhere any explanation in G, which, at the points in question, presents nothing peculiar.

In general, then, the paragraphy in F is neither derived nor derivable from that in G. But in at least one case of decisive moment there is a perfect agreement of the two codices that points back unerringly to a common parentage, however remote. In 1 Cor. 6:1 we read

^{audet aliquis}
 Ολμα ^{τις} τισ
Videt aliquis

Here the T has been dropped from both, and the ο capitalized. Indisputably, then, the division at this point was already made in their prototype. Hence we may infer with confidence that the paragraphs in F were already present in the archetype. For one such division implies many, and F* would scarcely have observed such a division once and once only. Also, the fact that G, too, has made the mistake of dropping the T proves clearly that the occasions for such misunderstandings actually existed in the originals of both F and G, and thus confirms our diagnosis of the whole situation. We believe that this blunder dates back more than one codical generation, as indicated by the capital O, and also by F's *videt* for *audet*. It seems hardly likely that even Zimmer will explain Ολμα for Τολμα as the result of assimilation to the (yet) unwritten *audet* above!

These omissions of initials are of such deep significance and such vital consequence that it seems well to give a list of them, at least nearly complete:

Rom. 4: 9,	<i>B</i> from <i>Beatitudo</i> , no space left.
5: 15 ^b , <i>E</i> from <i>Et</i> ,	<i>S</i> from <i>Si</i> , no space left.
5: 18, <i>A</i> from <i>Αρα</i> ,	<i>I</i> from <i>Igitur</i> , space left.
6: 1, <i>T</i> from <i>Ti</i> , large space left, [Q] (<i>recentissima manu</i>).	
6: 12,	<i>N</i> from <i>Non</i> , space left.
6: 15,	<i>Q</i> from <i>Quid</i> , space left.
6: 19, <i>a</i> in space for <i>A</i> ,	<i>H</i> from <i>Humanum</i> , space left.
7: 1, <i>H</i> in margin (<i>secunda manu</i>) followed by space, <i>A</i> in (<i>An</i>), (<i>r.m.</i> ²).	
7: 4, <i>ω</i> in margin (<i>s. m.</i> ³),	<i>I</i> in [<i>I</i>]aque (<i>r. m.</i>).
8: 12 <i>A</i> from <i>Αρα</i> ,	<i>E</i> from <i>Ergo</i> , no space.
8: 26, (Ω) <i>rec. manu</i> ,	<i>S</i> from <i>Similiter</i> , space left.
8: 28, <i>O</i> from <i>Οιδαμεν</i> ,	<i>S</i> from <i>Scimus</i> , no space.
8: 31, <i>T</i> (<i>s. m.</i>),	<i>Q</i> from <i>Quid</i> , no space.
8: 35, <i>T</i> (<i>s. m.</i>),	<i>Q</i> from <i>Quis</i> , no space.
8: 37, <i>A</i> from <i>Αλλεν</i> ,	<i>S</i> from <i>Sed</i> , no space.
9: 1, <i>A</i> from <i>Αληθιαν</i> , [V] (<i>r. m.</i>).	
9: 6, <i>O</i> from <i>Ουκ</i> ,	<i>N</i> from <i>Non</i> , no space.
9: 20, Ω <i>in margin</i> , an important confirmation.	
9: 19,	<i>D</i> from <i>Dicis</i> , no space.
9: 30, <i>T</i> in <i>Ti</i> (<i>s. m.</i>),	<i>Q</i> in [<i>Q</i>]uid (<i>s. m.</i>).
10: 1, <i>A</i> in <i>Αδελφοι</i> (<i>s. m.</i>),	<i>F</i> in [<i>F</i>]ratres (<i>s. m.</i>).
10: 14,	<i>Q</i> in [<i>Q</i>]uomodo (<i>s. m.</i>).
10: 19,	<i>S</i> in [<i>S</i>]ed (<i>s. m.</i>).
11: 7,	<i>Q</i> from <i>Quid</i> , no space.
11: 16,	<i>Q</i> from <i>Quod</i> , space left.
11: 22,	<i>V</i> from <i>Vide</i> , no space.
11: 25,	<i>N</i> from <i>Non</i> , no space.
11: 33. Ω <i>in margin</i> ;	[O] (<i>recentissime</i>).
12: 1, <i>Π</i> from <i>Παρακαλω</i> ;	<i>O</i> in [O]bscuro (<i>recentissime</i>)
12: 16, <i>M</i> from <i>Μη</i> (<i>μ</i> in marg.);	<i>N</i> from <i>Nolite</i> , no space.
13: 1, <i>Π</i> from <i>Πασαι</i> (<i>π</i> in m., <i>s. m.</i>);	<i>O</i> in [O]mnibus (<i>r. m.</i>).
13: 8, <i>M</i> from <i>Μηδενει</i> (<i>μ</i> in m.);	<i>N</i> from <i>Nemini</i> , spaces.
14: 1, [T]ον (<i>τ</i> in m., <i>s. m.</i>);	<i>I</i> in [<i>I</i>]nfirum (<i>r. m.</i>).
14: 10,	<i>T</i> from <i>Tu</i> , no space.
15: 1, <i>O s. m.</i> ; <i>o</i> in marg., <i>p. m.</i> ;	<i>D</i> in [D]ebemus (<i>r. m.</i>).
15: 14, <i>Π</i> from <i>Πεπισμαι</i> , no space (<i>π</i> in m., <i>s. m.</i>);	<i>C</i> in [<i>C</i> onfido] (<i>s. m.</i>).
15: 25, <i>N</i> from <i>Νυν</i> , no space (<i>ν</i> in m.);	<i>N</i> in [<i>N</i>] (<i>r. m.</i>).
15: 30, <i>Π</i> from <i>Παρακαλω</i> , no space (<i>π</i> in m., <i>s. m.</i>);	<i>O</i> from <i>Obsecro</i> , space.

² *I. e., recentissima manu.*

³ *I. e., secunda manu.*

- 16:1, Σ from Συ, no space (σ in m., s. m.); C in [C]ommendo (r. m.).
 16:3, A from Ασπασθαι (α in m., s. m.), no space; S from Salutate, no space.
 16:17, Π from Παρακαλω (π in m., s. m.); R from Rogo, no space.
 1 Cor. 5:1, O in [O]mnino (r. m.).
 6:1, T from ΤΟλμα, no space; Videt for Audet.
 2 Cor. 10:4, N in [N]am (r. m.).
 Eph. 3:1, T from Τουτον, no space.
 1 Thess. 4:1, Ποιπον for Λοιπον (π and δ in marg., p. m.⁴).
 4:13, Μυθελομεν for Ου θελομεν (η and μ in marg., p. m.).
 2 Thess. 2:1, Πρωτωμεν for Ερωτωμεν (π and R in marg., s. m.?).
 3:1, Ποιπον for Λοιπον (π in marg., s. m.).
 2 Tim. 1:13, T from ΤΠοτυπουσιν (both F and G).
 Tit. 1:5, T from Τουτον, no space.
 2:1, Σ from Συ, no space.
 2:6, T from Τουσ, no space.
 3:1, T from Υπομειμνησ, no space, A from Admone, space.
 Phil. vs. 4, E from Ευχαρειστω, no space.
 vs. 17, E from Ει, no space.

Similar omissions are found in the Latin of *Hebrews*; as E from Et, 4:15; Q from Qua propter, 6:1; H from His, 7:1.

Here is a very large body of very closely related facts; some general explanation must answer for all; in G there is no hint at any explanation of any. Inasmuch as the phenomena in Greek and Latin (F and f) are so exactly parallel, and inasmuch as the same are still present in *Hebrews*, where there is no Greek text, we seem irresistibly driven to assume the same kind of original for both F and f—an original widely different from G, and of which our present codex Augiensis is a practically exact copy. Hereby is established anew and on independent basis our previous conclusions that the Greek and Latin lines had been precisely and intelligently adjusted to each other in the archetype of our present codex. Therefore, that archetype was not G, in which no such adjustment whatever exists.

Even this is not all, however. We have yet another proof, entirely different, but equally decisive. The fact that F is copied line for line from its prototype is set in clear relief by the fact that occasionally whole lines have been omitted and then inserted at the foot of the page. Thus, at Rom. 11:8, 9 we read:

ακουειν. εωσ. τησ. σημερον
 λεγει. γεννηθτω. Η. τραπεζα.
 αυτων. εισ. παγδα. και. εισ.

Audiant usque in hodie
 num diem Et david
 dicit fiat mensa

⁴ I. e., prima manu.

Then at the bottom of the page we find :

εθνων. ποσω. μαλλον. το.	<i>diminutio coram divitiæ</i>
/·	/·
ημερασ. και δαυιδ	<i>gentium quanto magis</i>

Here it seems that every shadow of doubt is excluded. The eye of the scribe wandered and skipped the Greek line *ημερασ. και δαυιδ*, but not the corresponding Latin, *num diem. Et david*. Hence through the rest of the page the Latin matches, not the Greek line, but the next above. At or before the end of the page the scribe discovers his mistake and inserts the omitted line at the bottom. Observe that the Latin and Greek flow on, each in its own channel and each undisturbed by the other, in Leibnitzian pre-established harmony. In G the omitted line appears precisely in the middle of a line, and there is no explanation for its omission in copying.

A similar phenomenon is met with at 2 Cor. 12 : 10 :

του $\overline{\chi\upsilon}$ Δι. ο. ευδοκω. εν ^δ	$\overline{xpi.}$ <i>Propter qd. placeo mihi*</i>
^a	
εν. αν. γκαισ. εν. διωγμοισ.	<i>in necessitatibus in persecutionibus</i>

Then at the bottom of the page, separated in each of the two columns from what is above by a horizontal bar having the width of the column itself, we find :

δ ασθενιαισ. μου. εν. υβρεσιν.	<i>*in infirmitatibus in contumeliis</i>
--------------------------------	--

Here the scribe seems first to have omitted the Greek line, but to have discovered his blunder before writing the corresponding Latin ; accordingly he has placed both lines at the bottom and so has preserved the correspondence throughout. The secret of both omissions is thus an open one. They demonstrate incontrovertibly, what is already twice proved, that the Græco-Latin alignment in the Augiensis was already present in the pattern that lay before the scribe. It should be added that half of the omitted line forms the end of one line, and half the beginning of the next in G, so that we cannot imagine how it could have been omitted by any wandering of the eye in copying from that MS.

Moreover, on the face of it the proposition seems extremely improbable that the densely ignorant F scribe should take his Greek from one MS., but his Latin from another, though the first MS. contained both Greek and Latin, and should then adjust these independent texts to each other, line by line, word by word, syllable by syllable, though he certainly did not understand the Greek text he was thus

dividing. Improbable, did we say? The proposition is more properly called incredible, and nothing less than perfectly apodeictic proof could recommend it to our acceptance. No semblance of such proof is forthcoming.

We must not close this discussion without some reference to Hort's citation of a most corrupt passage, 2 Tim. 1 : 13, in proof of the alleged dependence of F on G. He holds that it is impossible for *two* scribes to have produced the *same* monstrosity: Ποτυπουσιν εχει υγεισ^ω εμνων των λογων from the correct text: Υποτυπωσιν εχε υγαινοντων λογων; hence he infers that the one must have copied from the other. It seems amazing that such a past-master in criticism should perpetrate such a paralogism. Hort *assumes* that the text in the originals of F and G was the now *accepted* text, but this assumption is utterly baseless. It is practically certain that the corrupted text of F and G had already existed for centuries in the originals of those MSS. How the corruption originated it is not necessary to inquire. We venture to suggest, however, that the dropping of the Υ is merely another example of the frequent loss of the initials and points back to a MS. in which the word began a paragraph, as does the capital Π, and that the υγεισ^ω εμνων represents an ancient variant, possibly υγει^ι σεμνων, the bar of course denoting omission. In any case, Hort's argument falls in ruin as soon as its false base is removed.

There is no escape then from the conclusion that the archetype of F offered the same division into lines as we now see in F itself. But that division is merely quantitative, into lines of about equal length, without any regard to words or sense; in particular, it is *not* stichometric. On the other hand, G presents a division, not denoted by lines, but by capitals, that is, not quantitative, but according to sense: that is, stichometric. We know of no other way to understand the capitalization in G. The stichometry may not be perfect, but it seems certainly to be present. So again the archetypes of the two codices are seen to go asunder. Apparently F would seem to represent the older tradition, but we have not space to follow up these indications. They are not negated by the coincidence of the larger gaps in the two MSS.; for there is no reason why such gaps should not be propagated through several generations of MSS.

There remain many other interesting, important, and difficult questions, which cannot be taken into consideration for the present. Among them one of the most puzzling concerns the original grouping

of the letters into words. It appears strange that anyone could make such atrocious blunders and yet so often be right. It seems certain that some of the errors in grouping reach far behind either F or G, behind even the Latin translations. Thus in 2 Tim. 2:17 we read: *et sermo eorum ut cancer serpit*, and this presupposes *και ο λογος αυτων ως γανγρα. ινα. νομην. εξει*, in particular, the misdivision *γανγρα. ινα* of both F and G. But on this we cannot enlarge. The object of this study is attained in the demonstration, with mathematical rigor, that the Codex Augiensis reproduces its archetype with servile fidelity, and that the archetype in question was not the Codex Boernerianus.